Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Application Number	10/803,465		
		Filing Date	March 18	March 18, 2004	
		First Named Inventor	Hiroyuki Ogiso		
		Art Unit	2817		
	Examiner Name	Kinkead,	Kinkead, Arnold M		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	9319S-000695		
	ENCLO	SURES (check all that apply)			
☐ Fee Transmittal Form		☑ Drawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)	
Fee Attached	Licens	Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
Amendment / Reply		Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final	Provisi	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information	
		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter	
Extension of Time Request	Termin	Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)		Issue fee transmittal (in duplicate); Replacement sheets 21/26-26/26 drawings; return post card	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement			pos	st card	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Rema	rks			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application					
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53					
SIG	NATURE OF	APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, (OR AGENT		
Firm or Harness, Dicke	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.		1	eg. No. ,382	
Signature J. /hugy fluids					
Date November 11, 20	November 11, 2005				
	CERTATICA	TE OF TRANSMISSION/MA	ILING		
I hereby certify that this corresponder Service with sufficient postage as fi Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the da	rst class mail i	n an envelope addressed to: (O or deposited Commissioner	with the United States Postal for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,	
Typed or printed name G. Gregory Schivley		161.1	Express Mail Label No.	EV 717 344 605 US (11/11/2005)	
Signature /J. /Luc		my/ Whiten	Date	November 11, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain albents by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or/suggestions for reducing this purden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1459, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1459, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

10/803,465

Filing Date:

3/18/2004

Applicant:

Hiroyuki Ogiso

Group Art Unit:

2817

Examiner:

Arnold M. Kinkead

Title:

VOLTAGE-CONTROLLED OSCILLATOR.

CLOCK

CONVERTER, AND ELECTRONIC DEVICE

Attorney Docket:

9319S-000695

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that

patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _ Nr 11, 2005

Bv:

Gregory Selbi

Reg. No.27,882 Bryant F. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600